



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

HARVARD LAW REVIEW.

Published monthly, during the Academic Year, by Harvard Law Students.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, \$2.50 PER ANNUM 35 CENTS PER NUMBER.

Editorial Board.

CHARLES E. HUGHES, JR., *President*,
WHEATON AUGUR,
MAXWELL BARUS,
LAWRENCE G. BENNETT,
JOHN G. BUCHANAN,
ROBERT W. BYERLY,
E. MERRICK DODD, JR.,
WILLIAM M. EVARTS,
CHARLES V. GRAHAM,
GEORGE L. HARRISON,
MAURICE HIRSCH,
ALLEN T. KLOTS,
ALFRED L. LOOMIS,

JAMES B. GRANT, JR., *Treasurer*,
MAX LOWENTHAL,
JOHN R. MCLANE,
HARRY O. PALMER,
ROBERT W. PERKINS, JR.,
STUART C. RAND,
EUSTACE J. SELIGMAN,
J. ROBERT SZOLD,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
WILLIAM S. WARFIELD, III,
CORNELIUS C. WEBSTER,
CHAUNCEY E. WHEELER,
FRANCIS S. WYNER.

THE LAW SCHOOL. — The registration in the School on November 15 for the last twelve years is shown in the following table: —

	1900-01	1901-02	1902-03	1903-04	1904-05	1905-06
Res. Grad. . .	I	I	—	4	I	I
Third year . .	144	149	167	180	182	192
Second year . .	202	190	196	201	232	216
First year . .	241	229	228	293	285	243
Specials . . .	58	59	49	60	58	64
	646	628	640	738	758	716

	1906-07	1907-08	1908-09	1909-10	1910-11	1911-12
Res. Grad. . .	—	2	—	—	2	3
Third year . .	190	171	169	187	178	219
Second year . .	199	198	207	191	238	217
First year . .	243	280	244	311	296	289
Unclassified . .	—	—	—	—	82	76
Specials . . .	62	63	64	70	3	4
	694	714	684	759	799	808

The following tables show the sources from which the twelve successive classes have been drawn, both as to previous college training and as to geographical districts: —

Class of	HARVARD GRADUATES.			Total.
	From Massachusetts.	New England outside of Massachusetts.	Outside of New England.	
1903	43	4	28	75
1904	47	5	17	69
1905	44	4	20	68
1906	52	7	32	91
1907	44	6	40	90
1908	39	5	27	71
1909	30	6	29	65
1910	46	9	38	93
1911	35	5	18	58
1912	36	10	28	74
1913	42	7	33	82
1914	31	6	16	53

GRADUATES OF OTHER COLLEGES				
Class of	From Massachusetts.	New England outside of Massachusetts.	Outside of New England.	Total.
1903	23	26	83	132
1904	25	29	74	128
1905	23	27	78	128
1906	30	45	92	167
1907	32	33	89	154
1908	19	33	96	148
1909	30	24	98	152
1910	25	27	101	153
1911	26	29	104	159
1912	38	33	150	221
1913	18	27	151	196
1914	27	37	151	215

HOLDING NO DEGREE.					
Class of	From Mas- sachusetts.	New England outside of Massachusetts..	Outside of New England.	Total.	Total of Class.
1903	21	1	12	34	241
1904	22	—	10	32	229
1905	12	2	18	32	228
1906	25	1	9	35	293
1907	18	5	18	41	285
1908	14	1	9	24	243
1909	11	3	12	26	243
1910	15	1	18	34	280
1911	12	1	14	27	244
1912	7	2	7	16	311
1913	5	—	13	18	296
1914	15	—	6	21	289

As the twenty-one Harvard seniors in the first year class have in each instance completed the work required for the A.B. degree, all members of the class are virtually college graduates. The same is true of practically the entire school. Of the seventy-six unclassified students thirty-four have entered this year, and of these, twenty-six are graduates of a college or university, and eight are graduates of law schools.

One hundred and forty-five colleges and universities have representatives now in the school, as compared with one hundred and thirty-eight last year and one hundred and twenty-four the previous year. In the first-year class eighty-three colleges and universities are represented as follows:

Harvard 74; Yale 33; Princeton 22; Dartmouth 15; Brown 11; Bowdoin 8; University of California, Clark College, Oberlin, Williams 4; Amherst, Bates, University of Chicago, Cornell University, University of Illinois, University of Iowa, University of Minnesota, New York University, University of Pennsylvania, 3; Alabama Polytechnic Institute, University of Arkansas, Beloit, Boston College, Buchtel, Carleton, Colorado College, University of Georgia, Holy Cross, University of Kansas, University of Michigan, University of Texas, Trinity (Conn.), Tufts, Union University, University of Virginia, Wabash, Washington and Jefferson, Wesleyan, 2; Allegheny, Bellevue, Bethel, Central University (Ky.), Columbia University, Cotner University, Delaware, De Pauw, Earlham, Elon, Emory, Fisk University, Greenville, Grinnell, Hamilton, Juniata, University of Kentucky, Kenyon, Knox, Lafayette, Loyola, University of Maine, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Middlebury, University of Mississippi, University of North Dakota, Northwestern University,

Ohio Wesleyan University, Oxford University, Parsons, Pennsylvania College, University of Rochester, Rutgers, Santa Clara, University of Tennessee, Tulane University, Ursinus, University of Utah, Washburn, Washington and Lee University, West Virginia University, Western Reserve University, University of Wisconsin, Wittenberg, Wofford, 1.

LIABILITY OF FUTURE INTERESTS IN PERSONALTY FOR OWNER'S DEBTS. — Although the ancient common law did not recognize the existence of future estates in personalty, the law became more liberal at an early period, and there has resulted an approximate assimilation of the rules governing the limitation of future interests in realty and personalty.¹ Remainders, vested² and contingent,³ legal⁴ and equitable,⁵ may without question be carved out of the absolute ownership of chattels. However, the power to deal with these interests when once created, has, in most jurisdictions, been confined to narrower limits. This is manifested most frequently in the restrictions placed on two closely allied incidents of ownership, alienability and liability to the demands of creditors.

In these two particulars, the law as to personalty and realty has followed much the same trend. The assignment of a vested remainder in either land or chattels was allowed at common law; the estate passed by deed as a present property right.⁶ But contingent remainders in land could be assigned only in equity or by estoppel,⁷ as they were not regarded as present interests,⁸ and, moreover, such an assignment was repugnant to the law of champerty and maintenance.⁹ Though the doctrines of champerty and maintenance never applied to personal property, the rule was the same.¹⁰ In several jurisdictions, this doctrine has been modified by statute and decision, so that a contingent interest may be assigned at law.¹¹

Although alienability and liability to the claims of creditors are two very similar attributes of property and other rights, they have often been disassociated in dealing with future estates. It is everywhere settled that a vested remainder in land may be sold on execution at law, title passing by sheriff's deed.¹² But a vested remainder in chattels is not subject to sale by common-law execution, as the writ of *fiery facias*

¹ See 2 BL. COMM. 398; 2 KENT COMM. 352. Cf. N. Y. CONSOL. LAWS, 1909, c. 41, § 11; N. Y. LAWS OF 1909, c. 45.

² Hyde v. Parrat, 1 P. Wms. 1; Langworthy v. Chadwick, 13 Conn. 42.

³ Logan v. Executor of Ladson, 1 Desaus. (S. C.) 271.

⁴ Dargan & Bradford v. Richardson, Dud. (Ga.) 62.

⁵ Patterson v. Devlin, McMull. Eq. (S. C.) 459.

⁶ Dargan & Bradford v. Richardson, *supra*.

⁷ Den d. Hopper v. Demarest, 21 N. J. L. 525; Watson v. Smith, 110 N. C. 6, 14 S. E. 640. See 4 KENT COMM. 260.

⁸ See WILLIAMS, REAL PROPERTY, 21 ed., 369.

⁹ See BUTLER AND HARGRAVE, NOTES ON CO. LITT., 265 a, note 212.

¹⁰ Ridgeway v. Underwood, 67 Ill. 419. It does not appear that a contingent remainder in chattels ever passed by estoppel.

¹¹ Lawrence v. Bayard, 7 Paige (N. Y.) 70; Ham v. Van Orden, 84 N. Y. 257. 1 REV. STAT. OF 1836, 725, § 35 was in force when these cases were decided. Putnam v. Story, 132 Mass. 205.

¹² Atkins v. Bean, 14 Mass. 404; Deadman v. Yantis, 230 Ill. 243, 82 N. E. 592; Sheridan v. House, 4 Keyes (N. Y.) 569.